



1 a word on the display.” The next step provides that the software operates “a window text-drawing  
2 function to obtain: - a windows bounding rectangle in which the word appears,” determines “- x, y  
3 coordinates and dimensions of the rectangle,” and recognizes “- fonts, characters and language of  
4 each word written within the rectangle.” Pixel-by-pixel scanning of the bounding rectangle is  
5 performed to determine the position of each character in the bounding rectangle, and the characters,  
6 fonts and the language used for each word are provided to a word and phrase recognition module.  
7 The software determines the characters forming the word based on the positions of the characters and  
8 the position of the work pointed at, and the word is analyzed based on the language, the characters,  
9 character positions, fonts and neighboring words and phrases. Thus, it appears from the description  
10 provided, that Rubin simply uses a scanning technique for scanning a selected word, or scanning one  
11 or more words from within a bounding rectangle.

12 Based on the disclosure noted by the Examiner and discussed above, Rubin’s approach for  
13 identifying one or more words input for accessing data in one or more databases is entirely different  
14 than what is recited by applicants’ claims. Clearly, Rubin does not teach or suggest any of the steps  
15 recited in subparagraphs (b)-(d) of applicants’ Claim 28. Specifically, Rubin does not teach or  
16 suggest the step of “invalidating an update region of the electronic display, wherein the update region  
17 is defined as a function of the cursor location in the electronic display.” Instead, Rubin either obtains  
18 a windows bounding rectangle in which a word appears, or responds to a user selecting a word.  
19 Further, Rubin does not teach or suggest “*forcing* the operating system output module to *re-render*  
20 the data to the update region of the electronic display,” or “copying the data from the operating  
21 system output module *while the operating system output module is re-rendering* the data to the  
22 update region of the electronic display” (emphasis added). Instead, Rubin teaches detecting character  
23 or characters comprising a word, and scanning one or more words that are selected or are within the  
24 bounding rectangle for input to a word recognition module. Accordingly, Rubin neither anticipates  
25 nor renders obvious the approach used by applicants, as defined in Claim 28.

26 In regard to Claims 29 and 40, the Examiner asserts that “Rubin discloses patching an .idata  
27 section associated with a target process that controls the electronic display,” but applicants actually  
28 recite that “the step of hooking into the operating system output module comprises” this step. The  
29 Examiner refers to column 1, lines 40-45 of Rubin in support of the assertion that Rubin discloses  
30 this step of patching the .idata section. However, this portion of Rubin simply indicates that the

1 method used by Rubin detects "a string of characters displayed in the first region," and then  
2 determines "in the string of characters, a word written in a first language by identifying an entry for  
3 the word in a computerized dictionary database." Applicants are hard pressed to understand how this  
4 portion of Rubin teaches or suggests hooking into an operating system output module or more  
5 specifically, how this portion teaches or suggest patching a specific section (i.e., the .idata section) of  
6 an operating system output module that is associated with a target process controlling an electronic  
7 display. The Examiner is cautioned that applicant has recited details of their method that are not  
8 taught or suggested by Rubin. As noted above, Rubin uses an entirely different approach for  
9 detecting one or more word or words employed to reference one or more databases. Accordingly,  
10 this rejection is not justified and should be withdrawn.

11 In rejecting Claims 30 and 35, the Examiner references FIG. 3 of Rubin, asserting that this  
12 figure teaches applicants' step of "forcing the operating system output module to re-render the data to  
13 the update region," by "invoking a redraw application programming interface that instructs the  
14 operating system to issue a paint message to a procedure for redrawing of the electronic display, said  
15 paint message causing the procedure to execute the operating system output module to redraw the  
16 update region of the electronic display window." Having carefully reviewed FIG. 3 of Rubin,  
17 applicants were unable to identify any teaching or suggestion of using a paint message, or of re-  
18 rendering data in an update region, as recited in these claims. Thus, this rejection should also be  
19 withdrawn.

20 Other dependent claims are also inappropriately rejected by the Examiner. To simplify this  
21 response, applicants have chosen to focus primarily on the rejection of the independent claims and  
22 not to traverse the rejection of each dependent claim. Applicants also have chosen not to address  
23 every comment or statement made by the Examiner with which applicants disagree. However,  
24 applicants' decision not to address each dependent claim rejection or each comment made by the  
25 Examiner in this response should not be construed as meaning that applicants agree with the  
26 Examiner. It is applicants' position that all claims in the present invention patentably distinguish  
27 over the cited art.

28 The Examiner has rejected independent Claim 33, which is directed to a system for capturing  
29 data displayed near a cursor location in an electronic display. Generally, the Examiner has asserted  
30 the same reasons supporting this rejection, as were noted above in connection with Claim 28.

1 Accordingly, the comments set forth by applicants in traversing the rejection of Claim 28 are also  
2 applicable in traversing the rejection of independent Claim 33. It should be apparent that Claims 28-  
3 36 all patentably distinguish over Rubin for the reasons noted above. Further, since dependent claims  
4 are patentable for at least the same reasons as the claims from which they depend, it will be apparent  
5 that all of the dependent claims in this group are also patentable.

6 Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103

7 Claims 1-15 have been rejected as unpatentable over Rubin in view of U.S. Patent  
8 No. 5,651,107 (Frank et al. - hereinafter referred to as "Frank"). The Examiner applies Rubin  
9 generally as discussed above in connection with the rejection of Claim 28, and relies upon Frank for  
10 teaching the display of data in semi-transparent windows that are persistently visible to a user and  
11 which enable content displayed thereunder to also be visible (the Examiner refers to Figure 8 of  
12 Frank). However, for the same reasons set forth above in traversing the rejection of Claim 28,  
13 applicants also respectfully note that Rubin fails to teach or suggest the specific steps recited in  
14 Claims 1 or 15.

15 For example, Rubin fails to teach or suggest "causing a target process associated with the  
16 target window to re-render the text to the target window in an update region that includes the cursor  
17 location." There is simply no mention within Rubin about re-rendering text or causing a target  
18 process that is displaying text within a window to re-render the text therein. As explained in detail  
19 above, Rubin uses an entirely different approach for providing input of one or more words used in  
20 accessing one or more databases. Even if one of ordinary skill in the art were motivated to modify  
21 Rubin to include a semi-transparent window for presenting data, there is no teaching in either  
22 reference cited that would explain how such a modification should be carried out in connection with  
23 the method disclosed by Rubin. Thus, the combination of Rubin and Frank proposed by the  
24 Examiner fails to teach or suggest each and every step or element of Claims 1 and 15, and there is  
25 insufficient teaching in these references, for enabling the proposed combination of Rubin and Frank  
26 to be achieved. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.


27 In rejecting Claims 3 and 17, the Examiner asserts that Rubin teaches at column 4,  
28 lines 30-40, applicants' recitation of "inserting machine instructions into a memory space of the  
29 target process," and executing the machine instructions, causing hooking of a text-out module,  
30 invalidating the update region, wherein the update region is defined as a function of the cursor

1 location, executing the text-out module to re-render the text to the update region, and copying the text  
2 from the text-out module while the text-out module is re-rendering the text to the update region.  
3 Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. Instead, Rubin teaches that a character  
4 recognition module is operative to detect a string of characters displayed in a first region of a display  
5 that is selected by user and to determine in the string of characters, a word written in a first language.  
6 Again, Rubin fails to teach the detailed recitation provided in applicants' claims. In effect, Rubin  
7 teaches away from the approach claimed by applicants and therefore, applicants' claimed approach is  
8 clearly nonobvious in view of Rubin.

9 In a similar fashion, each of the other portions of Rubin cited by the Examiner in rejecting the  
10 remaining dependent claims in this group fails to teach or suggest the specific recitation included in  
11 those claims. In any case, these dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the  
12 independent claim from which they depend. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-27 is not  
13 supported by the cited art and should be withdrawn.

14 In consideration of the remarks set forth above, all claims in the present application are  
15 patentable over the art of record. Since the application is in condition for allowance, the application  
16 should be passed to Issue without further delay. Should any questions remain, the Examiner is  
17 invited to telephone applicants' attorney as the number set forth below.


18 Respectfully submitted,

19   
20  
21 Michael C. King  
22 Registration No. 44,832

23 RMA:lrg

24 I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed  
25 envelope as first class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid addressed to: Commissioner for Patents,  
26 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on April 5, 2005.

27 Date: April 5, 2005

28   
29  
30